

**Procter & Gamble -- I.P. Division****IMPORTANT CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE**

The documents accompanying this telecopy transmission contain confidential information belonging to the sender which is legally protected. The information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named below. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this telecopied information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this telecopy in error, please immediately notify us by telephone (collect) to arrange for return of the telecopied document to us.

**FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET AND  
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8****RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
APR 28 2005****TO: Commissioner for Patents - United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Fax No. 703-872-9306

Phone No. 571-272-1229

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on 4-28 2005, to the above-identified facsimile number.

George H. Leal (Signature)

**FROM: George H. Leal** (Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate)

Fax No. 513-634-3007

Phone No. 513-634-1597

Listed below are the item(s) being submitted with this Certificate of Transmission:\*\*

Number of Pages Including this Page: 3

1) Response to Election/Restriction Requirement

(2 pages)

2)

3)

4)

5)

Comments:

Inventor(s): Andrea Branca et al.

S.N.: 10/715,752

Filed: November 18, 2003

Docket No.: CM2543CQ

\*\*Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of transmission, OR this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

<p><b>Certification of Mailing or Facsimile Transmission</b></p> <p>I hereby certify that I have reasonable basis to expect that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being submitted as indicated below:</p> <p>( ) mailed or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop _____, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450</p> <p>(X) facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via fax number (703) 872-9306</p> <p>George H. Leal Name _____ Signature <u>George H. Leal</u> Date <u>4-28-05</u></p>
--

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
APR 28 2005

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Application No.	:	10/715,752
Applicant(s)	:	Andrea Branca et al.
Filed	:	November 18, 2003
Title	:	Improved Process For Printing Actives Onto Articles
TC/A.U.	:	1734
Examiner	:	Cheryl N. Hawkins
Conf. No.	:	5522
Docket No.	:	CM2543CQ
Customer No.	:	27752

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION/ELECTION REQUIREMENT**

Mail StopAmendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
Dear Sir:

**INTRODUCTORY REMARKS**

The Office Action of March 28, 2005, contained a restriction requirement. The restriction requirement is hereby traversed. A provisional election is made below in order to satisfy the requirements for this Reply to be complete.

**Response to Requirement for Restriction of Inventions**

The Examiner has required, under 35 USC §121, election of a single disclosed invention for prosecution on the merits. In order to be fully responsive, Applicants

Appl. No. 10/715,752  
Atty. Docket No. CM2543CQ  
Amdt. dated April 28, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of March 28, 2005  
Customer No. 27752

provisionally elect Group I, claims 1-14 and 17-21 for examination on the merits with traversal while holding claims 15 and 16 in abeyance pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.142(b) until final disposition of the elected claims. Applicants also reserve the right to pursue each of the non-elected claims in one or more divisional applications.

Applicants respectfully traverse this restriction requirement. Applicants submit that the Examiner has not satisfied the requirements in rendering the restriction requirement. The MPEP states:

Under the statute an application may properly be required to be restricted to one of two or more claimed inventions only if they are able to support separate patents and they are either independent or distinct. If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

(MPEP § 803).

Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to provide a requisite basis for the Restriction Requirement since there would be no significant burden placed on the Examiner to search and examine claims 1-14, 15-16, and 17-21, together. As a result, the Restriction Requirement is improper and should be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By

  
Signature

Jay A. Krebs

Registration No. 41,914  
(513) 634-4856

Date: 4-28-2005  
Customer No. 27752  
(Amendment-Response to Office Action.doc)  
Revised 11/5/2004